

man? : Japan, no

Other ... NATO? 01

United: Klein: Britain's new "deterrent"
Turkey? (since Iraq, Iraq)

[of who?]

finger Schaffer 5-5-05

Germany (Def Min, today's German papers)
Will ask US to remove nukes!

(I 605, NRDC)

480 weapons

(targets: Iran, Russia,
Syria)

(Next: 8 USAF bases in 6 countries:

Germany; Belgium, Italy, Netherlands, Turkey

UK (Blair)

(Berlin

["No attack on Iran"]

or NK

or Syria

(1946; 1980 (RAND ^{think} tank)
We want control Iran / ME

no "counter-prolif

weapons, aggression

Next, Russia the nukes

(Range ships: US?

Russia

others?

NEU

Convention: India, China? (Pak?)

+ NNWS

NW FZ in Europe

No "bargain" with US on disarmament

No progress toward this (CTB signed)

nor will there be - without

change in USG - not into environment.

Role of new energy?

Happiest day for me since

German move;

- ambition from US are policy
- Colloids spent for CEU inspiration
- not France
UK?
Israel
- US (RE: China? India Japan?)
- NFO NSA's (not WHD)

(China: give up here threat us, Taiwan!)

(What reaction do we want from to
NK test? from intramission?)

not AFU of WMD's!

1. former PU = 200. Regard's
100 term's: 20,000

Not deal of US — 3, at first, joined
(not invited, to
disrupt, delay...)

Do ^{some} others really want disarmament?

Jan they want set together apart from US.

(like New Zealand: vs. US
(we!) bases)

5-8-05

Fred Kaplan:

The first draft of Axis of
Evil named only Iraq and North
Korea: David From wanted 3,
for rhetorical purposes!

It wasn't
that NK was
added as
non-Muslim.

Adding Iran reinforced Americans,
closed a real existing prospect of
 rapprochement

Clinton ended negot with NK!
Bush had already rejected Clinton
framework (which Powell had endorsed)
~~though~~ (an early slap at Powell)
though Clinton was approaching
a missile test ban - he chose instead
to negot in ME in final months).

Schell: China turned to its Bomb
(a ~~the~~ US design, given by Fuchs to
SU and by SU to China;
turned up in Kibya, in 'Chinese'
(China to Pak?)

China turned to Bomb after SU but then
down ~~to~~ in Quincy II, 1958
(US "success" → China Bomb!)

like: Soviet + France get mess together,
when US "~~lets~~ lets the down" in the
aggression in Suez 1956.

US threats to India in 1971, India-Pak/Bangladesh
→ from Bomb (Pak genocide)

likewise, Pak Bomb?

[WEB OF CRISIS: One crisis → one
prolif → one one crisis.

[Schell: Underlying respect for nuclear
status, has inherent anti-prolif.

Tolerating prolif is the (acceptable)
price of maintaining their own
nuclear arsenal.

Hands feel each other in "opposing" camps.
(including money).

Schell's

Schell questions whether the world (i.e. US)
has ever been

Why did CBS go for NPT (without
any of the Halpature "requirements")

(see JFK + advisors in VN)
CBS not troops + air...

Why hold out NPT? Did it postpone
nuc states in countries we really didn't
want to have nukes?

(Did we care about Sweden, Australia...

Schell: "The H-bomb - the "Super" - puts the
Super in Superpower."

(India, Pak, Japan...)

|| IS OUR CURRENT STRATEGIC POSTURE

|| an appropriate response to prospect of
China or Russian buildup? NO Crazy then,
(after 1965) crazy now + future! (OR: threat of
instability?) ~~does that~~

Schell: USC thinks that a world with nukes
is "safer" (our position is safer) with
(proliferated) nukes than without.

Not, "Beyond the NPT"

(instead of the NPT - for Disarmament plans/statement/NEU
+ then, for NP in next decade

- 1) Can world be made safer than now ^{despite US} with
new testing, new attacks on Iran, new prohib? (Maybe not:
AVOID THESE.
- 2) Can it be made safer than it could otherwise be? YES

Do we want US involvement Conference on
Abolition? At start?

No — get major industrial countries (US allies)
working on it against US wishes;
adopting a critical attitude on US &
Comm (+ post) intent, posture
NATO...

Isolate US (for its/our own good; just
as I want Congress + Court
+ Media to constrain Exe:
my "treason" to Exe
(loyalty to US Court, country,
troops, citizens...!)

(A "stall" truth from safes, when it
was wrongly withheld from sovereign public).

BREAK the solid NATO front

and NATO / Australia / Japan

and US / Russia!

5-6-05

(Toby! Humans break out!

See my suggestion to ^{in about Dec. 02?} Human Ambassador
(to UN?) on Prog: support, or abstain from
opposition (or initiate! less likely) ~~or~~ demand
of some action is UN that US/UK not use
nukes under any circumstances is Prog
(i.e. US-CW/BW)

Even if no NWS gives up nukes, nuc-dependent
States (Korea) can renounce dependence
without becoming NWS! Japan! (UK!

5-6-05

Why does State Com keep CW posture?

- 1) Senior RADM, officer slots, budget
- 2) MIC money
- 3) In case Russia or China ever confront US in future US limited conflicts, as in CW, providing "umbrella" vs US FU.
(US FS threat to deter them from intervention, retal or etc.)
(to CANDOR vs. SLOP = US and Russia and International Demeritization)

It is not that US just hasn't thought of what needs to be done to discourage proliferation

or, "hasn't focused on problem"

("ambiguity")

Refusal of true - front is always (?) a hoax: Nixon; now Bush on Iraq; USSR always on disarmament / abolition (since 1968).

Future Magazine:

26 states that do not now have nukes could have them within 6 months.

(answer to my question)

Verification of withdrawal of toe nukes:

(from Navy ships;
from South Korea
(from Europe? No)

5-6-05

Dan Kinnell: Doesn't believe NK will test — it's a bluff, for bargaining. "Not logical" ^{CIS} — if the test, the loss China [?], combination

Now, if the deal, would US follow. Breach of Korea?

[?] says: because of 9-11; NK will supply terrorists; and RNEP, etc.

OK — some voices will say that, but...

"Now will China, or India or Pak"

("none threatened of NK...")

[?] but if US does: say, prepares test site, to war in less than 18 months...

OK "Wf does from naval arms?"

If US does...

Pak (India) India (China, Pak) China

Wf France? Rebecca Johnson: us. Henny. If don't trust.

Wf UK? "UK won't give up while France keeps them. France + England together could give them up. But for each, there are their own claim to Perm seats + veto on Security Council; they don't want to give them up [to an EC president, or a rolling membership.

(Japan is big told, they can't get a perm. seat without giving up Ant. IX, preventing war.

And they want to stick close to US: want know

US are umbrella — which the "and" us. China + NK.

My question: Can't "nuc-dependent countries" under
US umbrella remove it?

NATO: Germany

Dutch have raised issue in parliament.

Belgium, too.

Italy, a question. (nucs unpopular)

(UK - no - but debate, along with

France: Blair: Britain's nuc "deterrent"

Italy? (since Iraq, maybe) [of who?]

[Other members of NATO? Spain, etc.

remove EU, umbrella

Germany...

[If they ever face a real threat, they could
go nuclear quickly.]

Harborschew thinks Putin would be willing to
enter serious disarm. negot.

Extra

Rebecca Johnson - briefed a NATO NUC planning group
on preferred route to abolition - in March? in
Prague - "it's on the agenda" she was told.

She doesn't believe Germany would have
said this today (a story 3 days ago - then denied...) ^{some}
without positive support from other NATO members.
It's controversial in NATO

US in NPT Conf: ultimatum, take-it-or-leave-it -
yet they won't get a deal. But no attack on those
countries won't confront US, + jeopardize bilateral
relations - Bush will punish dissenters.

Aug 10, 2005

?!

Met NYT on RPK speech
of June '65 on diplomacy

NYT July 1, '65 (Searcy)

MCN background on unes
(Porter)

(discussion of unes in VN)

See unes, VN

Holmes: SC unes Threats v. China, 1969

(and NRH on diplomacy)

{ First Ullman article For Pol.
{ Klaus frisch: French help

French - Israel

(Santa African: Sansen option

like French, Israel

NRH: MCN convention

of attack on China in '62 (?)

Frish: MCN on unes & China, Oct '64
(Kaiser?)